arXiv:1211.6151v1 [math.AP] 26 Nov 2012

Null controllability and Carleman estimates for parabolic equations with interior degeneracy

Genni Fragnelli
Dipartimento di Matematica
Università di Bari "Aldo Moro"
Via E. Orabona 4
70125 Bari - Italy
email: fragnelli@dm.uniba.it
Dimitri Mugnai
Dipartimento di Matematica e Informatica
Università di Perugia
Via Vanvitelli 1, 06123 Perugia - Italy
email: mugnai@dmi.unipg.it

Abstract

We consider a parabolic problem with degeneracy in the interior of the spatial domain, and we focus on controllability results through Carleman estimates for the associated adjoint problem. The novelty of the present paper is that the degeneracy is also in the interior of the control region, so that no previous result can be adapted to this situation.

1 Introduction

In the last recent years an increasing interest has been devoted to null controllability of degenerate parabolic equations. Indeed, as pointed out by several authors, many problems coming from physics (see, e.g., [28]), biology (see, e.g., [36]), and economics (see, e.g., [28] and [29]) are described by degenerate parabolic equations with degeneracy occurring at the boundary of the space domain. Among such degenerate problems we recall some applications arising in aeronautics (the Crocco equation, see, e.g., [16], [17], [28]), in physics (boundary layer models, see, e.g., [7] or models of Kolmogorov type, see, e.g., [4], or models of Grushin type, see, e.g., [3]), in genetics (Wright-Fisher and Fleming-Viot models, see, e.g., [30], [36]) and in mathematical finance (Black-Merton-Scholes, Longstaff, Cox-Ingersoll-Ross models, see, e.g., [20], [29]).

From the point of view of global null controllability, the behaviour of linear degenerate parabolic equations in both divergence form and non divergence form with Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions is by now well understood, see, for example, [2], [8], [11], [12], [13], [15], [17], [18], [19], [22], [23], [31], [32], [33] and [34] and the references therein: for all $T > 0$ and for all initial data u_0 in a suitable space there is a control h such that the solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (au_x)_x = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x) \end{cases} \tag{1. 1}$$

with the associated boundary conditions, satisfies $u(T,x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. The common point of all the previous papers is that the function a degenerates at the boundary of the domain. For example, as a, one can consider the double power function

$$a(x) = x^k(1-x)^\alpha, \quad x \in [0,1],$$

where k and α are positive constants. For related systems of degenerate equations we refer to [9] and [1].

Moreover, in [3] the authors study the null controllability of the parabolic equation associated with the Grushin-type operator $\mathcal{L} = \partial_x^2 + |x|^{2\gamma}\partial_y^2$, where $\gamma > 0$, in the rectangle $\Omega = (-1,1) \times (0,1)$, taking as control region the strip $\omega = (a,b) \times (0,1)$, $0 < a, b < 1$. We underline the fact that in [3] the degeneracy points are in the interior of the domain, but *outside* the control region.

To our best knowledge, [35] is the first paper treating a problem with a degeneracy which may occur in the interior of the spatial domain. In particular, Stahel considers a parabolic problem in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with Dirichlet, Neumann or mixed boundary conditions, associated with a $N \times N$ matrix a, which is positive definite and symmetric, but whose smallest eigenvalue might converge to 0 as the space variable approaches a singular set contained in the closure of the spatial domain. In this case, he proves that the corresponding abstract Cauchy problem has a solution, provided that $\underline{a}^{-1} \in L^q(\Omega, \mathbb{R})$ for some $q > 1$, where

$$\underline{a}(x) := \min\{a(x)\xi \cdot \xi : \|\xi\| = 1\}.$$

Moreover, while in [35] only the existence of a solution for the parabolic problem is considered, in [24] the authors analyze in detail the degenerate operator $\mathcal{A}u := (au_x)_x$ in the space $L^2(0,1)$, with or without weight, proving that in some cases it is nonpositive and selfadjoint, hence it generates a cosine family and, as a consequence, an analytic semigroup. In [24] the well-posedness of (1. 1) with Dirichlet boundary conditions is also treated, but nothing is said about controllability properties.

This paper is then concerned with the null controllability of the parabolic equation with interior degeneracy

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (au_x)_x = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), \\ u(t,0) = u(t,1) = 0, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), \end{cases} \tag{1. 2}$$

where $(t,x) \in Q_T := (0,T) \times (0,1)$, $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$, a degenerates at $x_0 \in (0,1)$ and the control $h \in L^2(Q_T)$ acts on a nonempty subdomain w of $[0,1]$, which satisfies the following property:

$$\begin{aligned} &\omega \subset\subset (0,1) \text{ and there exist } \omega_1 \subset (0,x_0), \omega_2 \subset (x_0,1) \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{such that } (\omega_1 \cup \omega_2) \subset\subset \omega \setminus \{x_0\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1. 3}$$

We shall admit two types of degeneracy for a, namely weak and strong degeneracy. In particular, we make the following assumptions:

Hypothesis 1.1. Weakly degenerate case (WD): Assume that there exists $x_0 \in (0,1)$ such that $a(x_0) = 0$, $a > 0$ on $[0,1] \setminus \{x_0\}$, $a \in W^{1,1}(0,1)$ and there exists $K \in (0,1)$ such that $(x - x_0)a' \leq Ka$ a.e. in $[0,1]$.

Hypothesis 1.2. Strongly degenerate case (SD): Assume that there exists $x_0 \in (0,1)$ such that $a(x_0) = 0$, $a > 0$ on $[0,1] \setminus \{x_0\}$, $a \in W^{1,\infty}(0,1)$ and there exists $K \in [1,2)$ such that $(x - x_0)a' \leq Ka$ a.e. in $[0,1]$.

Typical examples for weak and strong degeneracies are $a(x) = |x-x_0|^\alpha,\ 0 < \alpha < 1$ and $a(x) = |x - x_0|^\alpha,\ 1 \leq \alpha < 2)$, respectively.

Observe that if $x_0 \notin \overline{\omega}$ (for example if $w = w_1$ or $w = w_2$), then the global null controllability of (1. 2) follows as in [2]. The same controllability result holds if $w = w_1 \cup w_2$ and again $x_0 \notin \overline{\omega}$, at least in the strongly degenerate case: indeed, in this case, given $u_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$, u is a solution of (1. 2) if and only if the restrictions of u to $[0, x_0)$ and to $(x_0, 1]$, $u_{|_{[0,x_0)}}$ and $u_{|_{(x_0,1]}}$, are solutions to

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (au_x)_x = h(t,x)_{|_{[0,x_0)}}\chi_{\omega_1}(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,x_0), \\ u(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ (au_x)(t,x_0) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x)_{|_{[0,x_0)}}, \end{cases} \tag{1. 4}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (au_x)_x = h(t,x)_{|_{(x_0,1]}}\chi_{\omega_2}(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (x_0,1), \\ u(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ (au_x)(t,x_0) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x)_{|_{(x_0,1]}}, \end{cases} \tag{1. 5}$$

respectively (for the boundary conditions in x_0 we refer to [24]). Then, the global null controllability follows by [2, Theorem 4.1]. On the other hand, if ω is as in (1. 3), then we cannot deduce null controllability results for the two problems (1. 4) and (1. 5) from the ones presented in literature, since, to our best knowledge, there are no results if a degenerates at the boundary of the domain and the control acts exactly on the boundary.

As in [2], the main technical part of the paper is the analysis of the following adjoint problem:

$$\begin{cases} v_t + (a(x)v_x)_x = h, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1), \\ v(t,1) = v(t,0) = 0, & t \in (0,T). \end{cases} \tag{1. 6}$$

In particular, for any (sufficiently smooth) solution v of such a system we derive the Carleman estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} dxdt \\
&\leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_0^1 |h|^2 e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} dxdt + sc_1 \int_0^T \left[a\Theta e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} (x-x_0)(v_x)^2 dt \right]_{x=0}^{x=1} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{1. 7}$$

for all $s \geq s_0$, where s_0 and c_1 are suitable constants. Here $\Theta(t) := [t(T-t)]^{-4}$, and $\varphi(t,x) := \Theta(t)\psi(x)$, with $\psi(x) < 0$ given explicitly in terms of a, see (3. 3).

For the proof of the previous Carleman estimate a fundamental role is played by the following general Hardy-Poincaré type inequality proved in Proposition 2.1, of independent interest:

$$\int_0^1 \frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^2} w^2(x) dx \leq C \int_0^1 p(x)|w'(x)|^2 dx,$$

that we derive for all functions w such that

$$w(0) = 0 \quad (\text{or } w(1) = 0), \text{ and } \int_0^1 p(x)|w'(x)|^2 dx < +\infty.$$

Here p is *any* continuous function in $[0,1]$, with $p > 0$ on $[0,1] \setminus \{x_0\}$, $p(x_0) = 0$ and there exists $q \in (1,2)$ such that the function

$$x \longrightarrow \frac{p(x)}{|x-x_0|^q} \text{ is nonincreasing on the left of } x = x_0$$

and nondecreasing on the right of $x = x_0$.

Applying estimate (1. 7) to any solution v of the adjoint problem (1. 6), we derive the observability inequality

$$\int_0^1 v^2(0,x) dx \leq C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2(t,x) dxdt.$$

To prove this, it is crucial to extend in a suitable way the solution v of (1. 6), see Lemma 4.1. Then, using a standard technique in this framework, one can prove the null controllability of (1. 2).

Such a result is then extended to the semilinearproblem

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (a(x)u_x)_x + f(t,x,u) = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1), \\ u(t,1) = u(t,0) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,1), \end{cases} \tag{1. 8}$$

in the weakly degenerate case using the fixed point method developed in [21] for nondegenerate problems. We note that, as in the nondegenerate case, our method relies on a compactness result for which the fact that $\dfrac{1}{a} \in L^1(0,1)$ is an essential assumption. We also underline the fact that, if $f(t,x,u) = c(t,x)u(t,x)$, then the null controllability result holds also for the strongly degenerate case, since in this case it is a consequence of the results proved for (1. 2), see Corollary 5.1.

Finally, observe that on a we require that there exists $K \in (0,2)$ such that $(x-x_0)a' \le Ka$ a.e. in $[0,1]$. This technical assumption, which is essential to prove Lemma 3.2, is the same made, for example, in [2]. It is not strange since if $K \ge 2$ and the degeneracy occurs at the boundary of the domain, as in [2], the problem fails to be null controllable on the whole interval $[0,1]$ (see [15]). In this case the regional null controllability is the only property that can be expected, see also [10], [13] and [14]. We remark that if a degenerates in the interior of the domain, the example given in [15] cannot be adapted so easily to (1. 2), since the degeneracy point is inside the control region. However, we expect that also in this case the global null controllability fails on the whole domain. For this reason the last part of the paper is devoted to prove a regional and persistent result in very general situations, at least in the linear case. For this, we can weaken the assumptions both on the degenerate coefficient and the control set; nevertheless, in this setting we cover the case in which $(x-x_0)a' \le Ka$ with $K \ge 2$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give the precise setting for the weak and degenerate cases and some general tools we shall use several times; in particular a general Hardy–Poincaré inequality is established. In Section 3 we provided one of the main results of this paper, i.e. Carleman estimates. In Section 4 we apply the previous Carleman estimates to prove an observability inequality which, together with a Caccioppoli type inequality, lets us derive new null controllability results for degenerate problems, when the degeneracy is *inside* the control region. In Section 5 we extend the previous results to complete linear and semilinear problems. Finally, in Section 6 we consider the linear strongly degenerate case in more general assumptions, proving regional and persistent regional null controllability results.

2 Preliminary Results

As in [24], for the well-posedness of the problem, we consider two different weighted spaces, suitable to study two different situations, namely the *weak degenerate* and the *strong degenerate* cases:

CASE (WD):

$$H^1_a(0,1) := \big\{u \in L^2(0,1) \;\mid u \text{ absolutely continuous in } [0,1], \\ \sqrt{a}u_x \in L^2(0,1) \text{ and } u(0) = u(1) = 0\big\}$$

and

$$H^2_a(0,1) := \big\{u \in H^1_a(0,1) \mid au_x \in H^1(0,1)\big\};$$

CASE (SD):

$$H^1_a(0,1) := \big\{u \in L^2(0,1) \ \mid u \text{ locally absolutely continuous in } [0,x_0) \cup (x_0,1], \\ \sqrt{a}u_x \in L^2(0,1) \text{ and } u(0)=u(1)=0\big\}$$

and

$$H^2_a(0,1) := \big\{u \in H^1_a(0,1) |\, au_x \in H^1(0,1)\big\}.$$

In both cases we consider the norms

$$\|u\|^2_{H^1_a(0,1)} := \|u\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|\sqrt{a}u_x\|^2_{L^2(0,1)},$$

and

$$\|u\|^2_{H^2_a(0,1)} := \|u\|^2_{H^1_a(0,1)} + \|(au_x)_x\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}.$$

As proved in [24], problem (1. 2) is well-posed in the sense of the following theorem:

Theorem 2.1. *For all* $h \in L^2(Q_T)$ *and* $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$, *there exists a unique weak solution* $u \in \mathcal{C}([0,T];L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1_a(0,1))$ *of* (1. 2) *and there exists a universal positive constant* C *such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \|u(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \int_0^T \|u(t)\|^2_{H^1_a(0,1)}dt \le C(\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|h\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}). \quad (2.\ 1)$$

Moreover, if $u_0 \in D(\mathcal{A})$, *then*

$$u \in H^1(0,T;L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^2_a(0,1)) \cap \mathcal{C}([0,T];H^1_a(0,1)), \quad (2.\ 2)$$

and there exists a universal positive constant C *such that*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \Big(\|u(t)\|^2_{H^1_a(0,1)}\Big) + \int_0^T \Big(\|u_t\|^2_{L^2(0,1)} + \|(au_x)_x\|^2_{L^2(0,1)}\Big)\,dt \\ \le C\left(\|u_0\|^2_{H^1_a(0,1)} + \|h\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}\right). \quad (2.\ 3)$$

In order to prove estimates of Carleman type, as we intend to do, the following lemma is crucial:

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that Hypothesis* 1.1 *or* 1.2 *is satisfied.*

1. *Then for all* $\gamma \ge K$ *the map*

   $$x \mapsto \frac{|x-x_0|^\gamma}{a} \text{ is nonincreasing on the left of } x = x_0$$

   and nondecreasing on the right of $x = x_0$.

2. *If* $K < 1$, *then* $\dfrac{1}{a} \in L^1(0,1)$.

3. If $K \in [1,2)$*, then* $\dfrac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \in L^1(0,1)$.

Proof. The first point is an easy consequence of the assumption. Now, we prove the second point: by the first part, it follows that

$$\frac{|x-x_0|^K}{a(x)} \le \max\left\{\frac{x_0^K}{a(0)}, \frac{(1-x_0)^K}{a(1)}\right\}.$$

Thus

$$\frac{1}{a(x)} \le \max\left\{\frac{x_0^K}{a(0)}, \frac{(1-x_0)^K}{a(1)}\right\}\frac{1}{|x-x_0|^K}.$$

Since $K<1$, the right-hand side of the last inequality is integrable, and then $\dfrac{1}{a} \in L^1(0,1)$. Analogously, one obtains the third point. □

Remark 1. Observe that if $\dfrac{1}{a} \in L^1(0,1)$, then $\dfrac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \in L^1(0,1)$. On the contrary, the fact that $a \in C^1[0,1]$, $\dfrac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \in L^1(0,1)$ does not imply that $\dfrac{1}{a} \in L^1(0,1)$. Indeed, the assumptions on a imply that $a(x) = \displaystyle\int_{x_0}^{x} a_x(t)dt \le C|x-x_0|$ for a positive constant C and for all x in a neighborhood of x_0. Thus $\dfrac{1}{a(x)} \ge C\dfrac{1}{|x-x_0|} \notin L^1(0,1)$.

Proposition 2.1 (Hardy-Poincaré inequality)**.** *Assume that* $p \in \mathcal{C}([0,1])$, $p>0$ *on* $[0,1]\setminus\{x_0\}$, $p(x_0)=0$ *and there exists* $q \in (1,2)$ *such that the function*

$$x \longrightarrow \frac{p(x)}{|x-x_0|^q} \text{ is nonincreasing on the left of } x = x_0$$

and nondecreasing on the right of $x = x_0$.

Then, there exists a constant $C_{HP}>0$ *such that for any function* w*, locally absolutely continuous on* $[0,x_0)\cup(x_0,1]$ *satisfying*

$$w(0)=w(1)=0 \text{ and } \int_0^1 p(x)|w'(x)|^2\,dx < +\infty\,,$$

the following inequality holds:

$$\int_0^1 \frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^2} w^2(x)\,dx \le C_{HP}\int_0^1 p(x)|w'(x)|^2\,dx. \qquad (2.\ 4)$$

Proof. Fix any $\beta \in (1, q)$. Since $w(1) = 0$, applying Hölder's inequality and Fubini's Theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{x_0}^{1} \frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^2} w^2(x)\,dx \\
&= \int_{x_0}^{1} \frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^2} \Big(\int_x^1 ((y-x_0)^{\beta/2} w'(y))(y-x_0)^{-\beta/2}\,dy \Big)^2 dx \\
&\le \int_{x_0}^{1} \frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^2} \Big(\int_x^1 (y-x_0)^{\beta} |w'(y)|^2\,dy \int_x^1 (y-x_0)^{-\beta}\,dy \Big) dx \\
&\le \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{x_0}^{1} \frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^{1+\beta}} \Big(\int_x^1 (y-x_0)^{\beta} |w'(y)|^2\,dy \Big) dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{x_0}^{1} (y-x_0)^{\beta} |w'(y)|^2 \Big(\int_{x_0}^{y} \frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^{1+\beta}}\,dx \Big) dy \\
&= \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{x_0}^{1} (y-x_0)^{\beta} |w'(y)|^2 \Big(\int_{x_0}^{y} \frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^{q}} (x-x_0)^{q-1-\beta}\,dx \Big) dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, thanks to our hypothesis, we find

$$\frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^q} \le \frac{p(y)}{(y-x_0)^q}, \quad \forall\, x,\ y \in\ [x_0, 1],\ x < y.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{x_0}^{1} \frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^2} w^2(x)\,dx \\
&\le \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{x_0}^{1} (y-x_0)^{\beta} |w'(y)|^2 \Big(\int_{x_0}^{y} \frac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^{q}} (x-x_0)^{q-1-\beta}\,dx \Big) dy \\
&\le \frac{1}{\beta-1} \int_{x_0}^{1} \frac{p(y)}{(y-x_0)^{q}} (y-x_0)^{\beta} |w'(y)|^2 \Big(\int_{x_0}^{y} (x-x_0)^{q-1-\beta}\,dx \Big) dy \qquad (2.\ 5) \\
&= \frac{1}{(\beta-1)(q-\beta)} \int_{x_0}^{1} \frac{p(y)}{(y-x_0)^{q}} (y-x_0)^{q-\beta} (y-x_0)^{\beta} |w'(y)|^2 dy \\
&= \frac{1}{(\beta-1)(q-\beta)} \int_{x_0}^{1} p(y) |w'(y)|^2 dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, proceeding as before, and using the fact that $w(0) = 0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{x_0} \frac{p(x)}{(x_0-x)^2} w^2(x)\,dx \\
&\le \int_0^{x_0} \frac{p(x)}{(x_0-x)^2}\Big(\int_0^x (x_0-y)^\beta |w'(y)|^2\,dy \int_0^x (x_0-y)^{-\beta}\,dy\Big)\,dx \\
&\le \frac{1}{\beta-1}\int_0^{x_0} \frac{p(x)}{(x_0-x)^{1+\beta}}\Big(\int_0^x (x_0-y)^\beta |w'(y)|^2\,dy\Big)\,dx \\
&= \frac{1}{\beta-1}\int_0^{x_0} (x_0-y)^\beta |w'(y)|^2\Big(\int_y^{x_0} \frac{p(x)}{(x_0-x)^{1+\beta}}\,dx\Big)\,dy \\
&= \frac{1}{\beta-1}\int_0^{x_0} (x_0-y)^\beta |w'(y)|^2\Big(\int_y^{x_0} \frac{p(x)}{(x_0-x)^{q}}(x_0-x)^{q-1-\beta}\,dx\Big)\,dy.
\end{aligned}$$

By our hypothesis,

$$\frac{p(x)}{(x_0-x)^q} \le \frac{p(y)}{(x_0-y)^q}, \quad \forall\, x,\ y \in\ [0,x_0],\ y < x.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{x_0} \frac{p(x)}{(x_0-x)^2} w^2(x)\,dx \\
&\le \frac{1}{\beta-1}\int_0^{x_0} (x_0-y)^\beta |w'(y)|^2\Big(\int_y^{x_0} \frac{p(x)}{(x_0-x)^{q}}(x_0-x)^{q-1-\beta}\,dx\Big)\,dy \\
&\le \frac{1}{\beta-1}\int_0^{x_0} \frac{p(y)}{(x_0-y)^q}(x_0-y)^\beta |w'(y)|^2\Big(\int_y^{x_0} (x_0-x)^{q-1-\beta}\,dx\Big)\,dy \qquad (2.\ 6) \\
&= \frac{1}{(\beta-1)(q-\beta)}\int_0^{x_0} \frac{p(y)}{(x_0-y)^q}(x_0-y)^{q-\beta}(x_0-y)^\beta |w'(y)|^2 dy \\
&= \frac{1}{(\beta-1)(q-\beta)}\int_0^{x_0} p(y)|w'(y)|^2 dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (2. 5) and (2. 6), the proposition follows. □

3 Carleman Estimate for Degenerate Parabolic Problems

In this section we prove a crucial estimate of Carleman type, that will be useful to prove an observability inequality for the adjoint problem of (1. 2) in both the weakly and the strongly degenerate cases. Thus, let us consider the parabolic problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t + (av_x)_x = h, & (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1), \\ v(t,0) = v(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \end{cases} \qquad (3.\ 1)$$

where a satisfies the following assumption:

Hypothesis 3.1. The function a satisfies Hypothesis 1.1 or Hypothesis 1.2 and there exists $\vartheta \in (0, K]$ such that the function

$$x \longrightarrow \frac{a(x)}{|x-x_0|^{\vartheta}} \text{ is nonincreasing on the left of } x = x_0 \\ \text{and nondecreasing on the right of } x = x_0. \tag{3. 2}$$

Here K is the constant appearing in Hypothesis 1.1 or 1.2, respectively.

Remark 2. Observe that if $x_0 = 0$, Hypothesis 3.1 is the same introduced in [2] for the strongly degenerate case. On the other hand, in the weakly degenerate case, we require an additional assumption on a, with respect to the one introduced in [2]. This is due to the fact that in this case we don't know if $u(x_0) = 0$ for all $u \in H^1_a(0,1)$, as it happens when $x_0 = 0$. However, in both cases, Hypothesis 3.1 is satisfied if $a(x) = |x-x_0|^K$, with $K \in (0,2)$.

Now, let us introduce the function $\varphi(t,x) := \Theta(t)\psi(x)$, where

$$\Theta(t) := \frac{1}{[t(T-t)]^4} \quad \text{and} \quad \psi(x) := c_1 \left[\int_{x_0}^{x} \frac{y-x_0}{a(y)} dy - c_2\right], \tag{3. 3}$$

with $c_2 > \max\left\{\frac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)(2-K)}, \frac{x_0^2}{a(0)(2-K)}\right\}$ and $c_1 > 0$. A more precise restriction on c_1 will be needed later. Observe that $\Theta(t) \to +\infty$ as $t \to 0^+, T^-$, and by Lemma 2.1 we have that, if $x > x_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\psi(x) &\le c_1 \left[\int_{x_0}^{x} \frac{(y-x_0)^K}{a(y)} \frac{1}{(y-x_0)^{K-1}} dy - c_2\right] \\ &\le c_1 \left[\frac{(x-x_0)^K}{a(x)} \frac{(x-x_0)^{2-K}}{2-K} - c_2\right] \le c_1 \left[\frac{(1-x_0)^K}{a(1)} \frac{(1-x_0)^{2-K}}{2-K} - c_2\right] \\ &= c_1 \left[\frac{(1-x_0)^2}{(2-K)a(1)} - c_2\right] < 0.\end{aligned} \tag{3. 4}$$

In the same way one can treat the case $x \in [0, x_0)$, so that

$$\psi(x) < 0 \quad \text{for every } x \in [0,1].$$

Moreover, it is now easy to prove that $\psi \ge -c_1c_2$.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume Hypothesis* 3.1 *and let* $T > 0$. *Then, there exist two positive constants* C *and* s_0, *such that every solution* v *of* (3. 1) *in*

$$\mathcal{V} := L^2\big(0,T; H^2_a(0,1)\big) \cap H^1\big(0,T; H^1_a(0,1)\big) \tag{3. 5}$$

satisfies, for all $s \ge s_0$*,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^T\int_0^1 \left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2\right)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\\ &\le C\left(\int_0^T\int_0^1 |h|^2 e^{2s\varphi}dxdt + sc_1\int_0^T\left[a\Theta e^{2s\varphi(t,x)}(x-x_0)(v_x)^2dt\right]_{x=0}^{x=1}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where c_1 *is the constant introduced in* (3. 3)*.*

3.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

For $s > 0$, define the function

$$w(t,x) := e^{s\varphi(t,x)}v(t,x),$$

where v is the solution of (3. 1) in $\mathcal{V}$; observe that, since $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\psi < 0$, then $w \in \mathcal{V}$. Calculations show that w satisfies

$$\begin{cases}(e^{-s\varphi}w)_t + \left(a(e^{-s\varphi}w)_x\right)_x = h, & (t,x)\in(0,T)\times(0,1),\\ w(t,0) = w(t,1) = 0, & t\in(0,T),\\ w(T,x) = w(0,x) = 0, & x\in(0,1).\end{cases} \tag{3. 6}$$

The previous problem can be recast as follows. Set

$$Lv := v_t + (av_x)_x \quad \text{and} \quad L_s w = e^{s\varphi}L(e^{-s\varphi}w), \quad s > 0.$$

Then (3. 6) becomes

$$\begin{cases}L_s w = e^{s\varphi}h,\\ w(t,0) = w(t,1) = 0, & t\in(0,T),\\ w(T,x) = w(0,x) = 0, & x\in(0,1).\end{cases}$$

Computing $L_s w$, one has

$$L_s w = L_s^+ w + L_s^- w,$$

where

$$L_s^+ w := (aw_x)_x - s\varphi_t w + s^2 a\varphi_x^2 w,$$

and

$$L_s^- w := w_t - 2sa\varphi_x w_x - s(a\varphi_x)_x w.$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}2\langle L_s^+ w, L_s^- w\rangle &\le 2\langle L_s^+ w, L_s^- w\rangle + \|L_s^+ w\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)} + \|L_s^- w\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)}\\ &= \|L_s w\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)} = \|he^{s\varphi}\|^2_{L^2(Q_T)},\end{aligned} \tag{3. 7}$$

where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes the usual scalar product in $L^2(Q_T)$. As usual, we will separate the scalar product $\langle L_s^+ w, L_s^- w\rangle$ in distributed terms and boundary terms.

Lemma 3.1. *The following identity holds:*

$$
\left.
\begin{aligned}
&\langle L_s^+ w, L_s^- w\rangle \\
&= \frac{s}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^1 \varphi_{tt} w^2 dxdt + s\int_0^T\int_0^1 a(a\varphi_x)_{xx} w w_x dxdt \\
&- 2s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 a\varphi_x\varphi_{tx} w^2 dxdt + s\int_0^T\int_0^1 (2a^2\varphi_{xx} + aa'\varphi_x)(w_x)^2 dxdt \\
&+ s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 (2a\varphi_{xx} + a'\varphi_x)a\varphi_x^2 w^2 dxdt
\end{aligned}
\right\}\{D.T.\}
$$

$$
\{B.T.\}\left\{
\begin{aligned}
&+\int_0^T [a w_x w_t]_{x=0}^{x=1} dt - \frac{s}{2}\int_0^1 [w^2\varphi_t]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx + \frac{s^2}{2}\int_0^1 [a\varphi_x^2 w^2]_{t=0}^{t=T} dt \\
&+\int_0^T [-s\varphi_x(aw_x)^2 + s^2 a\varphi_t\varphi_x w^2 - s^3 a^2(\varphi_x)^3 w^2]_{x=0}^{x=1} dt \\
&+\int_0^T [-sa(a\varphi_x)_x w w_x]_{x=0}^{x=1} dt - \frac{1}{2}\int_0^1 \Big[a(w_x)^2\Big]_0^T dx.
\end{aligned}
\right.
\tag{3. 8}
$$

Proof. It is the same as [2, Lemma 3.4], but we represent it for the readers' convenience. First,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_0^1 L_s^+ w w_t dxdt = \int_0^T\int_0^1 \{(aw_x)_x - s\varphi_t w + s^2 a(\varphi_x)^2 w\} w_t dxdt \\
&= \int_0^T [a(x) w_x w_t]_{x=0}^{x=1} dt - \int_0^T \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left(\int_0^1 a(w_x)^2 dx\right) dt \\
&- \frac{s}{2}\int_0^T dt\int_0^1 \varphi_t (w^2)_t dx + \frac{s^2}{2}\int_0^T dt\int_0^1 a\varphi_x^2 (w^2)_t dx \\
&= \int_0^T [a w_x w_t]_{x=0}^{x=1} dt - \frac{s}{2}\int_0^1 [w^2\varphi_t]_{t=0}^{t=T} dx + \frac{s^2}{2}\int_0^1 [a(\varphi_x)^2 w^2]_{t=0}^{t=T} dt \\
&- \int_0^T \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\left(\int_0^1 a(w_x)^2 dx\right) dt + \frac{s}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^1 \varphi_{tt} w^2 dxdt \\
&- s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 a\varphi_x\varphi_{xt} w^2 dxdt.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3. 9}
$$

In addition, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_0^1 L_s^+w(-2sa\varphi_x w_x)dxdt = -2s\int_0^T\int_0^1 \varphi_x\left[\frac{(aw_x)^2}{2}\right]_x dxdt\\
&+2s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 a\varphi_t\varphi_x\left(\frac{w^2}{2}\right)_x dxdt - 2s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 a^2\varphi_x^3 ww_x dxdt\\
&= \int_0^T[-s\varphi_x(aw_x)^2 + s^2a\varphi_t\varphi_x w^2 - s^3a^2\varphi_x^3w^2]_{x=0}^{x=1}dt \qquad (3.\ 10)\\
&+s\int_0^T\int_0^1 \varphi_{xx}(aw_x)^2dxdt - s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1(a\varphi_t\varphi_x)_x w^2dxdt\\
&+s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1\{(a(\varphi_x)^2)_x a\varphi_x + a\varphi_x^2(a\varphi_x)_x\}w^2dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T\int_0^1 L_s^+w(-s(a\varphi_x)_x w)dxdt = \int_0^T[-saw_xw(a\varphi_x)_x]_{x=0}^{x=1}dt\\
&+s\int_0^T\int_0^1 aw_x\{(a\varphi_x)_{xx}w + (a\varphi_x)_x w_x\}dxdt \qquad (3.\ 11)\\
&+s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1(a\varphi_x)_x\varphi_t w^2dxdt - s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 a(\varphi_x)^2(a\varphi_x)_x w^2dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Adding (3. 9)-(3. 11), (3. 8) follows immediately. □

Now, the crucial step is to prove the following estimate:

Lemma 3.2. *Assume Hypothesis* 3.1. *Then there exists a positive constant* s_0 *such that for all* $s \ge s_0$ *the distributed terms of* (3. 8) *satisfy the estimate*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{s}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^1 \varphi_{tt}w^2dxdt + s\int_0^T\int_0^1 a(a\varphi_x)_{xx}ww_xdxdt\\
&-2s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 a\varphi_x\varphi_{tx}w^2dxdt + s\int_0^T\int_0^1(2a^2\varphi_{xx}+aa'\varphi_x)(w_x)^2dxdt\\
&+s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1(2a\varphi_{xx}+a'\varphi_x)a\varphi_x^2w^2dxdt\\
&\ge \frac{C}{2}s\int_0^T\int_0^1\Theta a(w_x)^2dxdt + \frac{C^3}{2}s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}w^2dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant C.

Proof. Using the definition of φ, the distributed terms of $\int_0^T\int_0^1 L_s^+wL_s^-wdxdt$

take the form

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{s}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^1 \ddot{\Theta}\psi w^2dxdt + s\int_0^T\int_0^1 a(a\psi')''\Theta w w_x dxdt\\&-2s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta\dot{\Theta}a(\psi')^2w^2dxd + s\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta a(2a\psi''+a'\psi')(w_x)^2dxdt \quad (3.\ 12)\\&+s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3 a(2a\psi''+a'\psi')(\psi')^2w^2dxdt.\end{aligned}$$

Because of the choice of $\psi(x)$, one has

$$2a(x)\psi''(x)+a'(x)\psi'(x) = c_1\frac{2a(x)-a'(x)(x-x_0)}{a(x)}$$

and $(a(x)\psi'(x))''=0$, a.e. in $[0,1]$. Thus (3. 12) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{s}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^1 \ddot{\Theta}\psi w^2dxdt &- 2s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta\dot{\Theta}a(\psi')^2w^2dxdt\\&+sc_1\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta(2a(x)-a'(x)(x-x_0))(w_x)^2dxdt\\&+s^3c_1\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3(\psi')^2(2a(x)-a'(x)(x-x_0))w^2dxdt.\end{aligned}$$

By assumption, one can estimate the previous terms in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{s}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^1 \ddot{\Theta}\psi w^2dxdt - 2s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta\dot{\Theta}a(\psi')^2w^2dxdt\\&+sc_1\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta(2a(x)-a'(x)(x-x_0))(w_x)^2dxdt\\&+s^3c_1\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3(\psi')^2(2a(x)-a'(x)(x-x_0))w^2dxdt\\&\geq -2s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta\dot{\Theta}a(\psi')^2w^2dxdt + \frac{s}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^1 \ddot{\Theta}\psi w^2dxdt\\&+sC\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta a(w_x)^2dxdt + s^3C^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}w^2dxdt,\end{aligned}$$

where $C>0$ is some universal positive constant. Observing that $|\Theta\dot{\Theta}|\leq c\Theta^{9/4}\leq c\Theta^3$ and $|\ddot{\Theta}|\leq c\Theta^{3/2}$, for a positive constant c, we conclude that, for s large enough,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|-2s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta\dot{\Theta}a(\psi')^2w^2dxdt\right| \leq 2cs^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3a(\psi')^2w^2dxdt\\&=2cs^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3c_1^2\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}w^2dxdt \leq \frac{C^3}{4}s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}w^2dxdt.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\left|\frac{s}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^1 \ddot{\Theta}\psi w^2dxdt\right| \le \frac{s}{2}c_1c\left|\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^{3/2}bw^2dxdt\right| + s\frac{c_1c_2}{2}c\left|\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^{3/2}w^2dxdt\right|, \tag{3. 13}$$

where $b(x) = \displaystyle\int_{x_0}^x \frac{y-x_0}{a(y)}dy \ge 0$. Now, since the function $x \mapsto \dfrac{|x-x_0|^K}{a(x)}$ is nonincreasing on $[0, x_0)$ and nondecreasing on $(x_0, 1]$ (see Lemma 2.1), one has $b(x) \le \dfrac{(x-x_0)^2}{(2-K)a(x)}$, see (3. 4). Hence

$$\frac{s}{2}c_1c\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^{3/2}bw^2dxdt \le \frac{C^3}{8}s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}w^2dxdt,$$

for s large enough.

It remains to bound the term $\left|\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^{3/2}w^2dxdt\right|$. Using the Young inequality, we find

$$\begin{aligned} &s\frac{c_1c_2}{2}c\left|\int_0^1 \Theta^{3/2}w^2dx\right| \\ &= s\frac{c_1c_2}{2}c\left|\int_0^1 \left(\Theta\frac{a^{1/3}}{|x-x_0|^{2/3}}w^2\right)^{3/4}\left(\Theta^3\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{a}w^2\right)^{1/4}\right| \\ &\le s\frac{3c_1c_2}{4}c\int_0^1 \Theta\frac{a^{1/3}}{|x-x_0|^{2/3}}w^2dx + s\frac{c_1c_2}{4}c\int_0^1 \Theta^3\frac{|x-x_0|^2}{a}w^2dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3. 14}$$

Now, consider the function $p(x) = (a(x)|x-x_0|^4)^{1/3}$. It is clear that, setting $C_1 := \max\left\{\left(\dfrac{x_0^2}{a(0)}\right)^{2/3}, \left(\dfrac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)}\right)^{2/3}\right\}$, by Lemma 2.1 we have $p(x) = a(x)\left(\dfrac{(x-x_0)^2}{a(x)}\right)^{2/3} \le C_1a(x)$ and $\dfrac{a^{1/3}}{|x-x_0|^{2/3}} = \dfrac{p(x)}{(x-x_0)^2}$. Moreover, using Hypothesis 3.1, one has that the function $\dfrac{p(x)}{|x-x_0|^q}$, where $q := \dfrac{4+\vartheta}{3} \in (1, 2)$, is nonincreasing on the left of $x = x_0$ and nondecreasing on the right of $x = x_0$. The Hardy-Poincaré inequality (see Proposition 2.1) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \Theta\frac{a^{1/3}}{|x-x_0|^{2/3}}w^2dx = \int_0^1 \Theta\frac{p}{(x-x_0)^2}w^2dx \le C_{HP}\int_0^1 \Theta p(w_x)^2dx \\ \le C_{HP}C_1\int_0^1 \Theta a(w_x)^2dx, \end{aligned} \tag{3. 15}$$

where C_{HP} and C_1 are the Hardy-Poincaré constant and the constant introduced before, respectively. Thus, for s large enough, by (3. 14) and (3. 15), we have

$$s\frac{c_1c_2}{2}c\int_0^1 \Theta^{3/2}w^2dx \leq \frac{C}{2}s\int_0^1 \Theta a(w_x)^2dx + \frac{C^3}{8}s^3\int_0^1 \Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}w^2dxdt,$$

for a positive constant C. Using the estimates above, from (3. 13) we finally obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{s}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^1 \ddot{\Theta}\psi w^2dxdt\right| &\leq \frac{C}{2}s\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta a(w_x)^2dxdt\\ &\quad+\frac{C^3}{4}s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}w^2dxdt.\end{aligned}$$

Summing up, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{s}{2}\int_0^T\int_0^1 \varphi_{tt}w^2dxdt + s\int_0^T\int_0^1 a(a\varphi_x)_{xx}ww_xdxdt\\ &-2s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1 a\varphi_x\varphi_{tx}w^2dxdt + s\int_0^T\int_0^1 (2a^2\varphi_{xx}+aa'\varphi_x)(w_x)^2dxdt\\ &+s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 (2a\varphi_{xx}+a'\varphi_x)a(\varphi_x)^2w^2dxdt\\ &\geq \frac{C}{2}s\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta a(w_x)^2dxdt + \frac{C^3}{2}s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}w^2dxdt.\end{aligned}$$

□

For the boundary terms in (3. 8), it holds:

Lemma 3.3. *The boundary terms in* (3. 8) *reduce to*

$$-s\int_0^T \left[\Theta(aw_x)^2\psi'\right]_{x=0}^{x=1}dt.$$

Proof. Using the definition of φ, we have that the boundary terms become

$$\begin{aligned}\text{(B.T.)} =&\int_0^T [aw_xw_t - sa\Theta(a\psi')'ww_x + s^2\dot{\Theta}\Theta a\psi\psi'w^2\\ &\quad - s^3a^2\Theta^3(\psi')^3w^2 - s\Theta(aw_x)^2\psi']_{x=0}^{x=1}dt\\ &+\int_0^1 \left[-\frac{s}{2}w^2\psi\dot{\Theta}+\frac{s^2}{2}aw^2(\psi')^2\Theta^2-\frac{1}{2}a(w_x)^2\right]_{t=0}^{t=T}dx.\end{aligned} \tag{3. 16}$$

Since $w \in \mathcal{V}$, $w \in C\big([0,T];H^1_a(0,1)\big)$. Thus $w(0,x)$, $w(T,x)$, $w_x(0,x)$, $w_x(T,x)$ and $\int_0^1\left[a(w_x)^2\right]_0^Tdx$ are indeed well defined. Using the boundary conditions of w and the definition of w, we get that

$$\int_0^1 \left[-\frac{s}{2}w^2\psi\dot{\Theta}+\frac{s^2}{2}aw^2(\psi')^2\Theta^2-\frac{1}{2}a(w_x)^2\right]_{t=0}^{t=T}dx = 0.$$

Moreover, since $w \in \mathcal{V}$, we have that $w_t(t,0)$ and $w_t(t,1)$ make sense. Therefore, also $a(0)w_x(t,0)$ and $a(1)w_x(t,1)$ are well defined. In fact $w(t,\cdot) \in H^2_a(0,1)$ and $a(\cdot)w_x(t,\cdot) \in W^{1,1}(0,1) \subset C([0,1])$. Thus $\int_0^T [aw_xw_t]_{x=0}^{x=1}dt$ is well defined and actually equals 0, as we get using the boundary conditions on w.

Now, consider the second, the third and the fourth terms of (3. 16). By definition of ψ and using the hypothesis on a, the functions $(a\psi')'$, $a\psi\psi'$ and $a^2(\psi')^3$ are bounded on $[0,1]$. Thus, by the boundary conditions on w, one has

$$\begin{aligned} s\int_0^T [a\Theta(a\psi')'ww_x]_{x=0}^{x=1}\,dt &= s^2\int_0^T \left[\dot\Theta\Theta a\psi\psi' w^2\right]_{x=0}^{x=1}dt \\ &= s^3\int_0^T \left[a^2\Theta^3(\psi')^3w^2\right]_{x=0}^{x=1}dt = 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

From Lemma 3.1, Lemma 3.2, and Lemma 3.3, we deduce immediately that there exist two positive constants C and s_0, such that all solutions w of (3. 6) satisfy, for all $s \geq s_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T\int_0^1 L_s^+ w L_s^- w\,dxdt \geq Cs&\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta a(w_x)^2dxdt \\ &+ Cs^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}w^2dxdt \\ &- s\int_0^T \left[\Theta a^2w_x^2\psi'\right]_{x=0}^{x=1}dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3. 17}$$

Thus, a straightforward consequence of (3. 7) and of (3. 17) is the next result.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume Hypothesis* 3.1 *and let $T > 0$. Then, there exist two positive constants C and s_0, such that all solutions w of* (3. 6) *in $\mathcal{V}$ satisfy, for all $s \geq s_0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} &s\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta a(w_x)^2dxdt + s^3\int_0^T\int_0^1 \Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}w^2dxdt \\ &\leq C\left(\int_0^T\int_0^1 |h|^2e^{2s\varphi(t,x)}dxdt + s\int_0^T \left[\Theta a^2w_x^2\psi'\right]_{x=0}^{x=1}dt.\right). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of w, we have $v = e^{-s\varphi}w$ and $v_x = -s\Theta\psi'e^{-s\varphi}w + e^{-s\varphi}w_x$. Thus, substituting, Theorem 3.1 follows.

4 Observability inequalities

4.1 Observability result and application to null controllability

Now, we associate to the linear problem (1. 2) the homogeneous adjoint problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t + (av_x)_x = 0, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ v(t,0) = v(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ v(T,x) = v_T(x), \end{cases} \tag{4. 1}$$

where $v_T(x) \in L^2(0,1)$. By the Carleman estimate in Theorem 3.1, we will deduce the following observability inequality for both the weakly and the strongly degenerate cases:

Proposition 4.1. *Assume Hypothesis* 3.1 *and let* $T > 0$. *Then there exists a positive constant* C_T *such that every solution* $v \in \mathcal{C}^0([0,T]; L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1_a(0,1))$ *of* (4. 1) *satisfies*

$$\int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx \le C_T \int_0^T \int_w v^2(t,x)dxdt. \tag{4. 2}$$

Using the observability inequality (4. 2) and a standard technique (e.g., see [26, Section 7.4]), one can prove the null controllability result for the linear degenerate problem (1. 2), one of the main results of this paper.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume Hypothesis* 3.1. *Then, given* $T > 0$ *and* $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$, *there exists* $h \in L^2(Q_T)$ *such that the solution* u *of* (1. 2) *satisfies*

$$u(T,x) = 0 \quad \textit{for every} \quad x \in [0,1].$$

Moreover

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 |h|^2 dxdt \le C \int_0^1 u_0^2(x)dx,$$

for some positive constant C.

4.2 Proof of Proposition 4.1

In this subsection we will prove, as a consequence of the Carleman estimate proved in Section 3, the observability inequality (4. 2). For this purpose, we will give some preliminary results. As a first step, consider the adjoint problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t + (av_x)_x = 0, & (t,x) \in Q_T, \\ v(t,0) = v(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ v(T,x) = v_T(x) \in D(\mathcal{A}^2), \end{cases} \tag{4. 3}$$

where

$$D(\mathcal{A}^2) = \Big\{ u \, \in \, D(\mathcal{A}) \, \Big| \, \mathcal{A}u \, \in \, D(\mathcal{A}) \, \Big\}$$

and $\mathcal{A}u := (au_x)_x$. Observe that $D(\mathcal{A}^2)$ is densely defined in $D(\mathcal{A})$ (see, for example, [6, Lemma 7.2]) and hence in $L^2(0,1)$. As in [11], [12] or [23], define the following class of functions

$$\mathcal{W} := \Big\{ v \text{ is a solution of } (4.\ 3) \Big\}.$$

Obviously (see, for example, [6, Theorem 7.5])

$$\mathcal{W} \subset C^1\big([0,T]\,;\, H^2_a(0,1)\big) \subset \mathcal{V} \subset \mathcal{U},$$

where, $\mathcal{V}$ is defined in (3. 5) and

$$\mathcal{U} := C([0,T]; L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T; H^1_a(0,1)). \tag{4. 4}$$

We start with

Proposition 4.2 (Caccioppoli's inequality)**.** *Let ω' and ω two open subintervals of $(0,1)$ such that $\omega' \subset\subset \omega \subset\subset (0,1)$ and $x_0 \notin \overline{\omega'}$. Let $s > 0$ and $\varphi(t,x) = \Theta(t)\Upsilon(x)$, where Θ is defined in (3. 3) and $\Upsilon \in C^1([0,1],(-\infty,0])$. Then, there exists a positive constant C_s such that every solution $v \in \mathcal{W}$ of the adjoint problem (4. 3) satisfies*

$$\int_0^T \int_{\omega'} (v_x)^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \;\le\; C_s \int_0^T \int_{\omega} v^2 dxdt. \tag{4. 5}$$

Proof. Let us consider a smooth function $\xi : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \le \xi(x) \le 1, & \text{for all } x \in [0,1], \\ \xi(x) = 1, & x \in \omega', \\ \xi(x) = 0, & x \in [0,1] \setminus \omega. \end{cases}$$

Since v solves (4. 3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_0^T \frac{d}{dt}\left(\int_0^1 \xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dx\right) dt = \int_0^T \int_0^1 2s\xi^2\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 + 2\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} v v_t dxdt \\
&= 2\int_0^T \int_0^1 \xi^2 s\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt + 2\int_0^T \int_0^1 \xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} v(-(av_x)_x) dxdt \\
&= 2\int_0^T \int_0^1 \xi^2 s\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt + 2\int_0^T \int_0^1 (\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} v)_x a v_x dxdt \\
&= 2\int_0^T \int_0^1 \xi^2 s\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt + 2\int_0^T \int_0^1 (\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi})_x a v v_x dxdt \\
&+ 2\int_0^T \int_0^1 \xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} a v_x^2 dxdt \\
&= 2\int_0^T \int_\omega \xi^2 s\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt + 2\int_0^T \int_\omega (\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi})_x a v v_x dxdt \\
&+ 2\int_0^T \int_\omega \xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} a v_x^2 dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
2\int_0^T \int_\omega \xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} a v_x^2 dxdt &= -2\int_0^T \int_\omega \xi^2 s\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt \\
&- 2\int_0^T \int_\omega (\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi})_x a v v_x dxdt \\
&\le -2\int_0^T \int_\omega \xi^2 s\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt + \int_0^T \int_\omega \left(\sqrt{a}\xi e^{s\varphi} v_x\right)^2 dxdt \\
&+ \int_0^T \int_\omega \left(\sqrt{a}\frac{(\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi})_x}{\xi e^{s\varphi}} v\right)^2 dxdt \\
&\le -2\int_0^T \int_\omega \xi^2 s\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt + \int_0^T \int_\omega \frac{[(\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi})_x]^2}{\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi}} a v^2 dxdt \\
&+ \int_0^T \int_\omega \xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} a v_x^2 dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \int_\omega \xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} a v_x^2 dxdt \le -2\int_0^T \int_\omega \xi^2 s\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt \\
+ \int_0^T \int_\omega \frac{[(\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi})_x]^2}{\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi}} a v^2 dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $x_0 \notin \omega'$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\inf_{\omega'} a(x) \int_0^T \int_{\omega'} e^{2s\varphi} v_x^2 dxdt \le \int_0^T \int_{\overline{\omega'}} \xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} a v_x^2 dxdt \\
&\le \int_0^T \int_{\omega} \xi^2 e^{2s\varphi} a v_x^2 dxdt \\
&\le -2 \int_0^T \int_{\omega} \xi^2 s\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt + \int_0^T \int_{\omega} \frac{[(\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi})_x]^2}{\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi}} a v^2 dxdt.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using the fact that $\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi}$ and $\varphi e^{2s\varphi}$ are bounded, and that $|x-x_0|^2/a$ is nonincreasing for $x < x_0$ and nondecreasing for $x > x_0$ (see Lemma 2.1), we can find a positive constant C_s such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&-2 \int_0^T \int_{\omega} \xi^2 s\varphi_t e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt + \int_0^T \int_{\omega} \frac{[(\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi})_x]^2}{\xi^2 e^{2s\varphi}} a v^2 dxdt \\
&\quad \le C_s \int_0^T \int_{\omega} v^2 dxdt,
\end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows. □

We shall also use the following

Lemma 4.1. *Assume Hypothesis* 3.1. *Then there exist two positive constants C and s_0 such that every solution $v \in \mathcal{W}$ of* (4. 3) *satisfies, for all $s \ge s_0$,*

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta a v_x^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_w v^2 dxdt.$$

Here Θ and φ are as in (3. 3).

For the proof of the previous lemma we need the following classical Carleman estimate (see, for example [2, Proposition 4.4]):

Proposition 4.3 (**Classical Carleman estimates).** *Let z be the solution of*

$$\begin{cases} z_t + (a z_x)_x = h \in L^2\big((0,T)\times(A,B)\big), \\ z(t,A) = z(t,B) = 0, \ t \in (0,T), \end{cases} \tag{4. 6}$$

where $a \in C^1\big([A,B]\big)$ is a strictly positive function. Then there exist two positive constants r and s_0 such that for any $s > s_0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_A^B s\Theta e^{r\zeta} (z_x)^2 e^{-2s\Phi} dxdt + \int_0^T \int_A^B s^3 \Theta^3 e^{3r\zeta} z^2 e^{-2s\Phi} dxdt \\
&\le c \int_0^T \int_A^B e^{-2s\Phi} h^2 dxdt - c \int_0^T \Big[\sigma(t,\cdot) e^{-2s\Phi(t,\cdot)} |z_x(t,\cdot)|^2 \Big]_{x=A}^{x=B} dt,
\end{aligned} \tag{4. 7}$$

for some positive constant c. Here the functions ζ, σ *and* Φ *are defined in the following way:*

$$\zeta(x) := \int_A^B \frac{1}{\sqrt{a(y)}}dy - \int_A^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{a(y)}}dy, \quad \sigma(t,x) := rs\Theta(t)e^{r\zeta(x)},$$

$$\Phi(t,x) := \Theta(t)\Psi(x) \textit{ and } \Psi(x) := e^{2r\zeta(A)} - e^{r\zeta(x)} > 0,$$

where $r, s > 0$ *and* $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times [A,B]$*.*

(Observe that $\Phi > 0$ and $\Phi(t,x) \to +\infty$, as $t \downarrow 0$, $t \uparrow T$.)

Proof of Lemma 4.1*.* Set $\lambda_i := \inf \omega_i$ and $\beta_i := \sup \omega_i$, $i = 1, 2$, where ω_1, ω_2 are as in (1. 3). Then, consider a smooth function $\xi : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq \xi(x) \leq 1, & \text{for all } x \in [0,1], \\ \xi(x) = 1, & x \in [\lambda_1, \beta_2], \\ \xi(x) = 0, & x \in [0,1] \setminus \omega. \end{cases}$$

Define $w := \xi v$, where v is the solution of (4. 3). Hence, w satisfies

$$\begin{cases} w_t + (aw_x)_x = (a\xi_x v)_x + \xi_x a v_x =: f, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1), \\ w(t,0) = w(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T). \end{cases} \tag{4. 8}$$

Applying Theorem 3.1 and using the fact that $w = 0$ in a neighborhood of $x = 0$ and $x = 1$, we have

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 \Big(s\Theta a (w_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} w^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi} \, dxdt \leq C \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} f^2 dxdt \tag{4. 9}$$

for all $s \geq s_0$. Then, using the definition of ξ and in particular the fact that ξ_x and ξ_{xx} are supported in $\tilde{\omega}$, where $\tilde{\omega} := [\inf \omega, \lambda_1] \cup [\beta_2, \sup \omega]$, we can write

$$f^2 = ((a\xi_x v)_x + \xi_x a v_x)^2 \leq C(v^2 + (v_x)^2)\chi_{\tilde{\omega}},$$

since the function a_x is bounded on $\tilde{\omega}$. Hence, applying Proposition 4.2 and (4. 9), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^{\beta_2} \left(s\Theta a (v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ &= \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^{\beta_2} \Big(s\Theta a (w_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} w^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi} \, dxdt \\ &\leq \int_0^T \int_0^1 \Big(s\Theta a (w_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} w^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi} \, dxdt \\ &\leq C \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{\omega}} e^{2s\varphi}(v^2 + (v_x)^2) dxdt \leq C \int_0^T \int_{\omega} v^2 dxdt, \end{aligned} \tag{4. 10}$$

for a positive constant C. Now, consider a smooth function $\eta : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \le \eta(x) \le 1, & \text{for all } x \in [0,1], \\ \eta(x) = 1, & x \in [\beta_2, 1], \\ \eta(x) = 0, & x \in \left[0, \frac{\lambda_2 + 2\beta_2}{3}\right]. \end{cases}$$

Define $z := \eta v$, where v is the solution of (4. 3). Then z satisfies (4. 6) and (4. 7), with $h := (a\eta_x v)_x + \eta_x a v_x$, $A = \lambda_2$ and $B = 1$. Since h is supported in $\left[\frac{\lambda_2+2\beta_2}{3}, \beta_2\right]$, by Propositions 4.2 and 4.3 with

$$\zeta(x) = \zeta_1(x) := \int_{\lambda_2}^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{a(y)}} dy - \int_{\lambda_2}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{a(y)}} dy,$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 s\Theta e^{r\zeta_1} (z_x)^2 e^{-2s\Phi} dxdt + \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 s^3 \Theta^3 e^{3r\zeta_1} z^2 e^{-2s\Phi} dxdt \\ &\le c \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 e^{-2s\Phi} h^2 dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_{\tilde{\omega}_1} e^{-2s\Phi} (v^2 + (v_x)^2) dxdt \\ &\le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt, \end{aligned} \tag{4. 11}$$

where $\tilde{\omega}_1 = (\lambda_2, \beta_2)$.

Now, choose the constant c_1 in (3. 3) so that

$$c_1 \ge \frac{e^{2r\zeta_1(\lambda_2)} - 1}{c_2 - \frac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)(2-K)}},$$

where ζ_1 is defined as before. Then, by definition of φ, the choice of c_1 and by Lemma 2.1, one can prove that there exists a positive constant k, for example

$$k = \max\left\{ \max_{[\lambda_2, 1]} a, \frac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)} \right\},$$

such that

$$a(x) e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} \le k e^{r\zeta_1(x)} e^{-2s\Phi(t,x)}$$

and

$$\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a(x)} e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} \le k e^{r\zeta_1(x)} e^{-2s\Phi(t,x)} \le k e^{3r\zeta_1(x)} e^{-2s\Phi(t,x)}$$

for every $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times [\lambda_2, 1]$. Thus, by (4. 11), one has

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 \left(s\Theta a (z_x)^2 + s^3 \Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} z^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\ &\le k \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 s\Theta e^{r\zeta_1} (z_x)^2 e^{-2s\Phi} dxdt + k \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 s^3 \Theta^3 e^{3r\zeta_1} z^2 e^{-2s\Phi} dxdt \\ &\le kC \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt, \end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant C. As a trivial consequence,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_{\beta_2}^1 \Big(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2\Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&= \int_0^T \int_{\beta_2}^1 \Big(s\Theta a(z_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} z^2\Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&\le \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_2}^1 \Big(s\Theta a(z_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} z^2\Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&\le kC \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt,
\end{aligned} \tag{4. 12}$$

for a positive constant C.

Thus (4. 10) and (4. 12) imply

$$\int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^1 \Big(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2\Big) e^{2s\varphi}\, dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt, \tag{4. 13}$$

for some positive constant C. To complete the proof it is sufficient to prove a similar inequality on the interval $[0, \lambda_1]$. To this aim define the functions

$$W(t,x) := \begin{cases} v(t,x), & x \in [0,1], \\ -v(t,-x), & x \in [-1,0], \end{cases}$$

where v solves (4. 3), and

$$\tilde{a}(x) := \begin{cases} a(x), & x \in [0,1], \\ a(-x), & x \in [-1,0]. \end{cases}$$

Then W satisfies the problem

$$\begin{cases} W_t + (\tilde{a}W_x)_x = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (-1,1), \\ W(t,-1) = W(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ W(T,x) = W_T(x), \end{cases} \tag{4. 14}$$

with

$$W_T(x) := \begin{cases} v_T(x), & x \in [0,1], \\ -v_T(-x), & x \in [-1,0]. \end{cases}$$

Now, consider a cut off function $\rho : [-1,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \le \rho(x) \le 1, & \text{for all } x \in [-1,1], \\ \rho(x) = 1, & x \in (-\lambda_1, \lambda_1), \\ \rho(x) = 0, & x \in \left[-1, -\frac{\lambda_1 + 2\beta_1}{3}\right] \cup \left[\frac{\lambda_1 + 2\beta_1}{3}, 1\right]. \end{cases}$$

Define $Z := \rho W$, where W is the solution of (4. 14). Then Z satisfies (4. 6) and (4. 7), with $h := (\tilde{a}\rho_x W)_x + \rho_x \tilde{a} W_x$, $A = -\beta_1$ and $B = \beta_1$. Now we use Proposition 4.2 and Proposition 4.3 with $\zeta(x) = \zeta_2(x)$, where

$$\zeta_2(x) := \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{a}(y)}} dy - \int_{-\beta_1}^{x} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{a}(y)}} dy;$$

the fact that $Z_x(t, -\beta_1) = Z_x(t, \beta_1) = 0$, the definition of W and the fact that ρ is supported in $\left[-\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{3}, -\lambda_1\right] \cup \left[\lambda_1, \frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{3}\right]$, give

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} s\Theta e^{r\zeta_2} (Z_x)^2 e^{-2s\Phi} dxdt + \int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} s^3 \Theta^3 e^{3r\zeta_2} Z^2 e^{-2s\Phi} dxdt \\ &\le C \int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} e^{-2s\Phi} h^2 dxdt \\ &\le C \int_0^T \int_{-\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{3}}^{-\lambda_1} (W^2 + W_x^2) dxdt + C \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^{\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{3}} (W^2 + W_x^2) dxdt \qquad (4.\ 15) \\ &= C \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^{\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{3}} (W^2 + W_x^2) dxdt \\ &\le C \int_0^T \int_{\lambda_1}^{\frac{\lambda_1+2\beta_1}{3}} (v^2 + (v_x)^2) dxdt \le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt, \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constants C, which we allow to vary from line to line.

Now, choose the constant c_1 in (3. 3) so that

$$c_1 \ge \frac{\max\{e^{2r\zeta_1(\lambda_2)} - 1, e^{2r\zeta_2(-\beta_1)} - 1\}}{c_2 - \max\left\{\frac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)(2-K)}, \frac{x_0^2}{a(0)(2-K)}\right\}}.$$

Thus, by definition of φ, one can prove as before that there exists a positive constant k, for example

$$k = \max\left\{\max_{[-\beta_1,\beta_1]} \tilde{a}, \frac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)}\right\},$$

such that

$$\tilde{a}(x) e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} \le k e^{r\zeta(x)} e^{-2s\Phi(t,x)}$$

and

$$\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}(x)} e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} \le k e^{r\zeta(x)} e^{-2s\Phi(t,x)} \le k e^{3r\zeta(x)} e^{-2s\Phi(t,x)}$$

for every $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times [-\beta_1, \beta_1]$. Thus, by (4. 15), one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \Big(s\Theta \tilde{a} (Z_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}} Z^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&\le k \int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} s\Theta e^{r\zeta} (Z_x)^2 e^{-2s\Phi} dxdt + k \int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} s^3\Theta^3 e^{3r\zeta} Z^2 e^{-2s\Phi} dxdt \\
&\le kC \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt.
\end{aligned} \tag{4. 16}$$

Hence, by (4. 16) and the definition of W and Z, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_0^{\lambda_1} \Big(s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 + s\Theta a (v_x)^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&= \int_0^T \int_0^{\lambda_1} \Big(s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} W^2 + s\Theta a W_x^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&\le \int_0^T \int_{-\lambda_1}^{\lambda_1} \Big(s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}} W^2 + s\Theta \tilde{a} W_x^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&= \int_0^T \int_{-\lambda_1}^{\lambda_1} \Big(s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}} Z^2 + s\Theta \tilde{a} Z_x^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&\le \int_0^T \int_{-\beta_1}^{\beta_1} \Big(s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{\tilde{a}} Z^2 + s\Theta \tilde{a} Z_x^2 \Big) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&\le C \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt,
\end{aligned} \tag{4. 17}$$

for a positive constant C.

Therefore, by (4. 13) and (4. 17), Lemma 4.1 follows. $\square$

We shall also use the following

Lemma 4.2. *Assume Hypothesis* 3.1 *and let $T > 0$. Then there exists a positive constant C_T such that every solution $v \in \mathcal{W}$ of* (4. 3) *satisfies*

$$\int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx \le C_T \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2(t,x)dxdt.$$

Proof. Multiplying the equation of (4. 3) by v_t and integrating by parts over $(0,1)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \int_0^1 (v_t + (av_x)_x) v_t dx = \int_0^1 (v_t^2 + (av_x)_x v_t) dx = \int_0^1 v_t^2 dx + [av_x v_t]_{x=0}^{x=1} \\
&- \int_0^1 a v_x v_{tx} dx = \int_0^1 v_t^2 dx - \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt} \int_0^1 a(v_x)^2 \ge -\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_0^1 a(v_x)^2 dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, the function $t \mapsto \int_0^1 a(v_x)^2 dx$ is increasing for all $t \in [0,T]$. In particular, $\int_0^1 av_x(0,x)^2dx \le \int_0^1 av_x(t,x)^2dx$. Integrating the last inequality over $\left[\frac{T}{4}, \frac{3T}{4}\right]$, Θ being bounded therein, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 a(v_x)^2(0,x)dx &\le \frac{2}{T}\int_{\frac{T}{4}}^{\frac{3T}{4}}\int_0^1 a(v_x)^2(t,x)dxdt \\ &\le C_T \int_{\frac{T}{4}}^{\frac{3T}{4}}\int_0^1 s\Theta a(v_x)^2(t,x)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemma 4.1 and the previous inequality, there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\int_0^1 a(v_x)^2(0,x)dx \le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2 dxdt. \tag{4. 18}$$

Proceeding again as in the proof of Lemma 3.2 and applying the Hardy-Poincaré inequality, by (4. 18), one has

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^1 \left(\frac{a}{(x-x_0)^2}\right)^{1/3} v^2(0,x)dx &= \int_0^1 \frac{p}{(x-x_0)^2}v^2(0,x)dx \\ &\le C_{HP}\int_0^1 p(v_x)^2(0,x)dx \\ &\le C_1C_{HP}\int_0^1 a(v_x)^2(0,x)dx \le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2dxdt,\end{aligned}$$

for a positive constant C. Here $p(x) = (a(x)|x-x_0|^4)^{1/3}$, C_{HP} is the Hardy-Poincaré constant and $C_1 := \max\left\{\left(\frac{x_0^2}{a(0)}\right)^{2/3}, \left(\frac{(1-x_0)^2}{a(1)}\right)^{2/3}\right\}$, as before.

By Lemma 2.1, $\dfrac{a(x)}{(x-x_0)^2}$ is nondecreasing on $[0,x_0)$ and nonincreasing on $(x_0,1]$, then

$$\left(\frac{a(x)}{(x-x_0)^2}\right)^{1/3} \ge C_2 := \min\left\{\left(\frac{a(1)}{(1-x_0)^2}\right)^{1/3}, \left(\frac{a(0)}{x_0^2}\right)^{1/3}\right\} > 0.$$

Hence

$$C_2\int_0^1 v(0,x)^2dx \le C\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2dxdt$$

and the thesis follows. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Let $v_T \in L^2(0,1)$ and let v be the solution of (4. 1) associated to v_T. Since $D(\mathcal{A}^2)$ is densely defined in $L^2(0,1)$, there exists a sequence $(v_T^n)_n \subset D(\mathcal{A}^2)$ which converges to v_T in $L^2(0,1)$. Now, consider the solution v_n associated to v_T^n. Obviously, $(v_n)_n$ converges to v in $L^\infty(0,T;L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1_a(0,1))$ (see, e.g., [5]) and, by Lemma 4.2,

$$\int_0^1 v_n^2(0,x)dx \le C_T \int_0^T \int_\omega v_n^2 dxdt.$$

Clearly,

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_0^T \int_\omega v_n^2 dxdt = \int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt$$

and

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \int_0^1 v_n^2(0,x)dx = \int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx,$$

so that Proposition 4.1 is now proved. □

5 Linear and Semilinear Extensions

5.1 Linear extension

In this subsection we want to extend the global null controllability result proved in the previous section to the linear problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (a(x)u_x)_x + c(t,x)u = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1), \\ u(t,1) = u(t,0) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,1), \end{cases} \tag{5. 1}$$

where $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$, $h \in L^2(Q_T)$, $c \in L^\infty(Q_T)$, ω is as in (1. 3) and a satisfies Hypothesis 3.1. Observe that the well-posedness of (5. 1) follows by [24, Theorem 4.1]. As for the previous case, the global null controllability of (5. 1) follows in a standard way from an observability inequality for the solution of the associated adjoint problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t + (av_x)_x - cv = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1), \\ v(t,1) = v(t,0) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ v(T) = v_T \in L^2(0,1). \end{cases} \tag{5. 2}$$

To obtain an observability inequality like the one in Proposition 4.1, the following corollary, consequence of Theorem 3.1, is crucial. For this, consider the problem

$$\begin{cases} v_t + (a(x)v_x)_x - cv = h, & (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1), \\ v(t,1) = v(t,0) = 0, & t \in (0,T). \end{cases} \tag{5. 3}$$

Corollary 5.1. *Assume Hypothesis* 3.1 *and let* $T > 0$*. Then, there exist two positive constants* C *and* s_0*, such that every solution* v *in* $\mathcal{V}$ *of* (5. 3) *satisfies, for all* $s \geq s_0$*,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&\leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_0^1 |h|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + sc_1 \int_0^T \left[a\Theta e^{2s\varphi}(x-x_0)(v_x)^2 dt \right]_{x=0}^{x=1} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where c_1 *is the constant introduced in* (3. 3)*.*

Proof. Rewrite the equation of (5. 3) as $v_t + (av_x)_x = \bar{h}$, where $\bar{h} := h + cv$. Then, applying Theorem 3.1, there exists two positive constants C and $s_0 > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^T \int_0^1 \left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2 + s^3\Theta^3 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 \right) e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&\leq C \left(\int_0^T \int_0^1 |\bar{h}|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + sc_1 \int_0^T \left[a\Theta e^{2s\varphi}(x-x_0)(v_x)^2 dt \right]_{x=0}^{x=1} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{5. 4}$$

for all $s \geq s_0$. Using the definition of $\bar{h}$, the term $\int_0^T \int_0^1 |\bar{h}|^2 e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} dxdt$ can be estimated in the following way

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 |\bar{h}|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \leq 2 \int_0^T \int_0^1 |h|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt + 2\|c\|^2_{L^\infty(Q_T)} \int_0^T \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dxdt. \tag{5. 5}$$

Applying the Hardy-Poincaré inequality (see Proposition 2.1) to $w(t,x) := e^{s\varphi(t,x)}v(t,x)$ and proceeding as in (3. 14), recalling that $0 < \inf \Theta \leq \Theta \leq c\Theta^2$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} v^2 dx = \int_0^1 w^2 dx &\leq C \int_0^1 a(w_x)^2 dx + \frac{s}{2} \int_0^1 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} w^2 dx \\
&\leq C\Theta \int_0^1 a e^{2s\varphi}(v_x)^2 dx + C\Theta^3 s^2 \int_0^1 e^{2s\varphi} v^2 \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Using this last inequality in (5. 5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \int_0^1 |\bar{h}|^2 e^{2s\varphi(t,x)} dxdt \leq 2 &\int_0^T \int_0^1 |h|^2 e^{2s\varphi} dxdt \\
&+ \|c\|^2_{L^\infty(Q_T)} C \int_0^T \int_0^1 \Theta a e^{2s\varphi}(v_x)^2 dxdt \\
&+ \|c\|^2_{L^\infty(Q_T)} C s^2 \int_0^T \int_0^1 \Theta^3 e^{2s\varphi} \frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a} v^2 dxdt,
\end{aligned} \tag{5. 6}$$

for a positive constant C. Using this inequality in (5. 4), we obtain

$$\int_0^T\int_0^1\left(s\Theta a(v_x)^2+s^3\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2\right)e^{2s\varphi}dxdt\le C\Big(2\int_0^T\int_0^1|h|^2e^{2s\varphi}dxdt$$
$$+\int_0^T\int_0^1\Theta ae^{2s\varphi}(v_x)^2dxdt+s^2\int_0^T\int_0^1e^{2s\varphi}\Theta^3\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{a}v^2dxdt$$
$$+sc_1\int_0^T\left[a\Theta e^{2s\varphi}(x-x_0)(v_x)^2dt\right]_{x=0}^{x=1}\Big).$$

Hence, for all $s\ge s_0$, where s_0 is assumed sufficiently large, the thesis follows. $\square$

As a consequence of the previous corollary, one can deduce an observability inequality for the adjoint problem (5. 3). In fact, without loss of generality we can assume that $c\ge 0$ (otherwise one can reduce the problem to this case introducing $\tilde v:=e^{-\lambda t}v$ for a suitable λ). Using this assumption we can prove that the analogous of Lemma 4.1 and of Lemma 4. 5 still hold true. Thus, as before, one can prove the following observability inequality:

Proposition 5.1. *Assume Hypothesis* 3.1 *and let* $T>0$. *Then there exists a positive constant* C *such that every solution* $v\in\mathcal{U}$ *of* (5. 2) *satisfies*

$$\int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx\le C_T\int_0^T\int_\omega v^2(t,x)dxdt. \tag{5. 7}$$

Here

$$\mathcal{U}:=H^1(0,T;L^2(0,1))\cap L^2(0,T;H^2_a(0,1))\cap\mathcal{C}^0([0,T];H^1_a(0,1)).$$

Thus the null controllability property follows in a standard way:

Theorem 5.1. *Assume Hypothesis* 3.1. *Then, given* $T>0$ *and* $u_0\in L^2(0,1)$, *there exists* $h\in L^2(Q_T))$ *such that the solution* u *of* (5. 1) *satisfies*

$$u(T,x)=0\quad\textit{for every}\quad x\in[0,1].$$

Moreover

$$\int_0^T\int_0^1|h|^2dxdt\le C\int_0^1u_0^2(x)dx,$$

for some positive constant C.

5.2 Semilinear extension

In this section we extend the result of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 5.1 to semilinear degenerate parabolic equation of the type

$$\begin{cases}u_t-(a(x)u_x)_x+f(t,x,u)=h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x)\in(0,T)\times(0,1),\\ u(t,1)=u(t,0)=0, & t\in(0,T),\\ u(0,x)=u_0(x), & x\in(0,1),\end{cases}\tag{5. 8}$$

where $(t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1)$, $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$, $h \in L^2(Q_T)$, and ω is as in (1. 3). Moreover, on a and f we make the following assumptions:

Hypothesis 5.1. The function a satisfies Hypothesis 1.1 and (3. 2).

Hypothesis 5.2. Let $f : [0,T]\times[0,1]\times\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be such that

1. $$\forall\, q \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (t,x) \mapsto f(t,x,q) \text{ is measurable,} \tag{5. 9}$$

2. $$\text{for a.e. } (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1), \quad f(t,x,0) = 0. \tag{5. 10}$$

3. $f_q(t,x,q)$ exists, f_q is a Carathéodory function and there exists $C > 0$ such that for a.e. $(t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1)$ and for every $q \in \mathbb{R}$
$$|f_q(t,x,q)| \le C. \tag{5. 11}$$

Under the previous assumptions, by [24, Theorem 4.6], we have that (5. 8) has a solution $u \in C([0,T];L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^1_a(0,1))$. We underline the fact that this existence result is based on the following compact result, for which the assumption $\dfrac{1}{a} \in L^1(0,1)$ is crucial:

Theorem 5.2 ([24], Theorem 5.4)**.** *Assume Hypothesis* 5.1. *Then*

$$H^1(0,T;L^2(0,1)) \cap L^2(0,T;H^2_a(0,1)) \textit{ is compactly imbedded in } L^2(0,T;H^1_a(0,1)) \cap C(0,T;L^2(0,1)).$$

To prove controllability results we will use, as in [2] or in [10], a fixed point method. For this purpose, we consider the linear problem associated to (5. 8), i.e.

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (a(x)u_x)_x + c(t,x,u)u = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1), \\ u(t,1) = u(t,0) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,1), \end{cases} \tag{5. 12}$$

where

$$c(t,x,u) := \int_0^1 f_q(t,x,\lambda u)d\lambda.$$

Then, by Theorem 5.1, one has that there exists a control $h \in L^2(Q_T)$ such that

$$u(T,x) = 0 \text{ for all } x \in [0,1]$$

and

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 |h|^2 dxdt \le C \int_0^1 u_0(x)^2 dx,$$

for a positive constant C. Using this result, Theorem 5.2 and the Schauder's Theorem, one can prove as, for example, in [2] or [10], that (5. 8) is global null controllable:

Theorem 5.3. *Assume Hypotheses* 5.1 *and* 5.2. *Then, given* $T > 0$ *and* $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$, *there exists* $h \in L^2(Q_T)$ *such that the solution* u *of* (5. 8) *satisfies*

$$u(T,x) = 0 \ \ \textit{for every} \ \ x \in [0,1].$$

Moreover

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 |h|^2 dxdt \le C \int_0^1 u_0^2(x)dx,$$

for some positive constant C.

6 The linear strongly degenerate case under general assumptions: regional and persistent regional controllability

In this section we consider the linear problem (5. 1) under weaker assumptions on a and on the control set ω.

Hypothesis 6.1. There exists $x_0 \in (0,1)$ such that $a(x_0) = 0$, $a > 0$ on $[0,1] \setminus \{x_0\}$, $a \in W^{1,\infty}(0,1)$ and $a^{-1} \notin L^1(0,1)$.

Note that the strongly degenerate case falls within this setting, as well as the case in which $(x - x_0)a' \le Ka$ when $K \ge 2$.

Concerning the control set, we only require that ω is an open set compactly contained in $(0,1)$ with $x_0 \in \omega$.

We give the following definition:

Definition 6.1. Problem (5. 1) is regional null controllable at time T in a set $\mathscr{C}$ if for all $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$ there exists $h \in L^2(Q_T)$ such that the solution u of (5. 1) satisfies

$$u(T,x) = 0 \ \ \text{for every} \ \ x \in \mathscr{C}. \tag{6. 1}$$

As pointed out in [13], [14], [15], we note that the global null controllability is a stronger property than (6. 1), in the sense that the former is automatically preserved with time. More precisely, if $u(T,x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0,1]$ and if we stop controlling the system at time T, then for all $t \ge T$, $u(t,x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0,1]$. On the contrary, regional null controllability is a weaker property: in general, (6. 1) is no more preserved with time if we stop controlling at time T. Thus, it is important to improve the previous result, as shown in [13], [14] or in [15], proving that the solution can be forced to vanish identically on a set $\mathscr{C}$ during a given time interval (T,T'), i.e. that the solution is persistent regional null controllable, according to the following

Definition 6.2. Problem (5. 1) is persistent regional null controllable at time $T' > T > 0$ in $\mathscr{C}$, if for all $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$ there exists $h \in L^2(Q_{T'})$ such that the solution u of (5. 1) satisfies

$$u(t,x) = 0 \ \ \text{for} \ \ (t,x) \in [T,T'] \times \mathscr{C}. \tag{6. 2}$$

Since we assume that $x_0 \in \omega$, and ω is open and compactly contained in $(0, 1)$, we can find

$$\alpha, \beta \in \omega \text{ and } 0 < \alpha < x_0 < \beta < 1. \tag{6. 3}$$

We have the following result:

Theorem 6.1. *Consider $T' > T > 0$ and $u_0 \in L^2(0, 1)$. Assume that $c \in L^\infty(Q_{T'})$ and that Hypothesis* 6.1 *is satisfied. Then:*

(i) Regional null controllability. *For every α and β satisfying* (6. 3)*, there exists $h \in L^2(Q_T)$ such that the solution u of* (5. 1) *satisfies*

$$u(T, x) = 0 \;\text{ for every }\; x \in [0, \alpha] \cup [\beta, 1].$$

Moreover, there exists a positive constant C_T such that

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 h^2(t, x) dx dt \le C_T \int_0^1 u_0^2(x) dx. \tag{6. 4}$$

(ii) Persistent regional null controllability. *For every α and β satisfying* (6. 3)*, there exists $h \in L^2(Q_{T'})$ such that the solution u of* (5. 1) *satisfies*

$$u(t, x) = 0 \text{ for } (t, x) \in [T, T'] \times ([0, \alpha] \cup [\beta, 1]).$$

Moreover, there exists a positive constant $C_{T,T'}$ such that

$$\int_0^{T'} \int_0^1 h^2(t, x) dx dt \le C_{T,T'} \int_0^1 u_0^2(x) dx. \tag{6. 5}$$

Remark 3. An analogous result was proved in [13], [14] and [15] when the degeneracy occurs at the boundary of the domain. But, while in [15] the proof was based on suitable *regional* observability inequalities, (which constituted the major technical part of the paper), here, as in [13] or in [14], we directly deduce (i) from the classical null controllability results known for *nondegenerate* parabolic equations (see, e.g., [25] and [27]), using a technique based only on cut off functions. Then, (ii) follows from (i) (as in [15]).

Proof of Theorem 6.1. **(i):** First of all, we construct two suitable cut-off functions. Given

$$\delta \in \left(0, \min\left\{x_0 - \alpha, \beta - x_0, \right\}\right),$$

consider ϕ_1 and $\phi_2 \in \mathcal{C}^\infty([0, 1])$ such that $0 \le \phi_1, \phi_2 \le 1$,

$$\phi_1(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in [\alpha + \delta, 1], \\ 1, & x \in (0, \alpha) \end{cases}$$

and

$$\phi_2(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in [0, \beta - \delta], \\ 1, & x \in [\beta, 1]. \end{cases}$$

As a first step, we consider the problems

$$\begin{cases} v_t - (av_x)_x + cv = h_1\chi_{\omega\cap(0,\alpha+\delta)}(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,\alpha+\delta), \\ v(t,0) = v(t,\alpha+\delta) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ v(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,\alpha+\delta), \end{cases} \tag{6. 6}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} w_t - (aw_x)_x + cw = h_2\chi_{\omega\cap(\beta-\delta,1)}(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (\beta-\delta,1), \\ w(t,\beta-\delta) = w(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ w(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (\beta-\delta,1). \end{cases} \tag{6. 7}$$

Since there is no degeneracy on $(0,\alpha+\delta) \cup (\beta-\delta,1)$, by classical results for linear nondegenerate parabolic equation in bounded domain (see for example [25] or [27]), we have that there exist $h_1 \in L^2((0,T)\times(0,\alpha+\delta))$ and $h_2 \in L^2((0,T)\times(\beta-\delta,1))$ such that the solutions v of (6. 6) and w of (6. 7) satisfy

$$v(T,x) = 0, \ \forall\ x\ \in (0,\alpha+\delta) \quad \text{and} \quad w(T,x) = 0, \ \forall\ x\ \in (\beta-\delta,1).$$

Moreover, there exist two positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|h_1\|^2_{L^2((0,T)\times(0,\alpha+\delta))} \le C_1\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(0,\alpha+\delta)} \text{ and} \\ &\|h_2\|^2_{L^2((0,T)\times(\beta-\delta,1))} \le C_2\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\beta-\delta,1)}. \end{aligned} \tag{6. 8}$$

As a consequence, the usual estimate of v and w in terms of h_1 and h_2, respectively, imply:

$$\int_0^T \|v(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,\alpha+\delta)}dt + \int_0^T \|v_x(t)\|^2_{L^2(0,\alpha+\delta)}dt \le C_{1,T}\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(0,\alpha+\delta)} \tag{6. 9}$$

and

$$\int_0^T \|w(t)\|^2_{L^2(\beta-\delta,1)}dt + \int_0^T \|w_x(t)\|^2_{L^2(\beta-\delta,1)}dt \le C_{2,T}\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\beta-\delta,1)}, \tag{6. 10}$$

for some positive constants $C_{1,T}$ and $C_{2,T}$.

Now, extend v to a function (still denoted by v for the sake of simplicity) defined in $[0,1]$ and obtained by an odd reflection around $\alpha+\delta$, and, if necessary, also around $2\alpha+2\delta$, $3\alpha+3\delta$, and so on, until $x=1$ is reached. Then $\tilde{v}(t,x) := \phi_1(x)v(t,x)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}_t - (a\tilde{v}_x)_x + c(t,x)\tilde{v} = \tilde{h}_1(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1), \\ \tilde{v}(t,0) = \tilde{v}(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ \tilde{v}(0,x) = \phi_1(x)u_0(x), & x \in (0,1). \end{cases}$$

Similarly, $\tilde{w}(t,x) := \phi_2(x)w(t,x)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{w}_t - (a\tilde{w}_x)_x + c(t,x)\tilde{w} = \tilde{h}_2(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1), \\ \tilde{w}(t,0) = \tilde{w}(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ \tilde{w}(0,x) = \phi_2(x)u_0(x), & x \in (0,1). \end{cases}$$

Here $\tilde{h}_1(t,x) := \phi_1 h_1 \chi_{\omega\cap(0,\alpha+\delta)} - (\phi_1)_x(av)_x - (\phi_1)_{xx}av - (\phi_1)_x a v_x$ and $\tilde{h}_2(t,x) := \phi_2 h_2 \chi_{\omega\cap(\beta-\delta,1)} - (\phi_2)_x(aw)_x - (\phi_2)_{xx}aw - (\phi_2)_x a w_x$. (Notice that $(\phi_1)_x, (\phi_1)_{xx}$, $(\phi_2)_x, (\phi_2)_{xx}$ are supported in $(\alpha, \alpha+\delta)\cup(\beta-\delta,\beta)$). Clearly, $\tilde{v}$ and $\tilde{w}$ satisfy

$$\tilde{v}(T,x) = 0 \;\forall\; x \;\in [0,1] \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{w}(T,x) = 0 \;\forall\; x \;\in [0,1].$$

Moreover, using (6. 9) and the fact that $\tilde{h}_1 \equiv 0$ on $(\alpha+\delta, 1)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \int_0^1 \tilde{h}_1^2 dxdt \;&\le K\left(\int_0^T \int_0^{\alpha+\delta} h_1^2 dxdt + \int_0^T \int_\alpha^{\alpha+\delta} |v|^2 dxdt \right.\\ &\left. + \int_0^T \int_\alpha^{\alpha+\delta} |v_x|^2 dxdt\right)\\ &\le K_{1,T}\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(0,\alpha+\delta)},\end{aligned}$$

where $K_{1,T}$ is a positive constant depending on T. Analogously, by (6. 10), we get that there exists a positive constant $K_{2,T}$ such that

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 \tilde{h}_2^2 dxdt \le K_{2,T}\|u_0\|^2_{L^2(\beta-\delta,1)}.$$

Now, let z be the solution of

$$\begin{cases} z_t - (az_x)_x + cz = 0, & (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1),\\ z(t,0) = z(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T),\\ z(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,1)\end{cases} \tag{6. 11}$$

(the well-posedness of (6. 11) follows from [24, Theorem 4.1]). Then, setting $\xi = 1 - \phi_1 - \phi_2$, the function $\tilde{z}(t,x) := \xi(x)z(t,x)$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{z}_t - (a\tilde{z}_x)_x + c\tilde{z} = \tilde{h}_3\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T)\times(0,1),\\ \tilde{z}(t,0) = \tilde{z}(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T),\\ \tilde{z}(0,x) = \xi(x)u_0(x), & x \in (0,1),\end{cases}$$

where $\tilde{h}_3(t,x) := -\xi_x(az)_x - \xi_{xx}az - \xi_x a z_x$ (note that ξ_x, ξ_{xx} are supported in $(\alpha,\alpha+\delta)\cup(\beta-\delta,\beta)$). Moreover, $\tilde{z}$ satisfies

$$\tilde{z}(T,x) = 0, \;\forall\; x \;\in [0,\alpha]\cup[\beta,1],$$

and, proceeding as for $\tilde{h}_1$, one can prove that there exists a positive constant $K_{3,T}$ such that

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 \tilde{h}_3^2 dxdt \le K_{3,T}\int_0^1 u_0^2(x)dx.$$

Finally,

$$u := \tilde{v} + \tilde{w} + \tilde{z}$$

solves

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (au_x)_x + cu = h\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1) \\ u(t,0) = u(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ u(0,x) = (\phi_1 + \phi_2 + \xi)u_0(x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,1), \end{cases}$$

where

$$h := \tilde{h}_1 + \tilde{h}_2 + \tilde{h}_3.$$

Moreover

$$u(T,x) = 0 \ \forall \ x \in [0,\alpha] \cup [\beta, 1],$$

and we have found a positive constant C_T such that

$$\int_0^T \int_0^1 h^2 dxdt \le C_T \int_0^1 u_0^2(x)dx.$$

(ii): Take $\tilde{\alpha}$ and $\tilde{\beta}$ in ω such that $0 < \alpha < \tilde{\alpha} < x_0 < \tilde{\beta} < \beta < 1$.

By the first part of the theorem, it follows that for all $T > 0$ and $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$, there exists $h_1 \in L^2(Q_T)$ such that the solution z of

$$\begin{cases} z_t - (az_x)_x + cz = h_1\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1), \\ z(t,0) = z(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ z(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,1), \end{cases}$$

satisfies $z(T,x) = 0$, for all $x \in [0,\tilde{\alpha}] \cup [\tilde{\beta}, 1]$. Then, we set $z^T(\cdot) := z(T,\cdot) \in L^2(0,1)$ and we consider the solution v of

$$\begin{cases} v_t - (av_x)_x + cv = 0, & (t,x) \in (T,T') \times (0,1), \\ v(t,0) = v(t,1) = 0, & t \in (T,T'), \\ v(T,x) = z^T(x), & x \in (0,1). \end{cases}$$

Now, we choose a cut-off function $\psi \in \mathcal{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ such that $0 \le \psi \le 1$ and

$$\begin{cases} \psi(x) = 1, & x \in [\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}], \\ \psi(x) = 0, & x \in [0,\alpha] \cup [\beta, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Then, $\tilde{v} := \psi v$ solves

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{v}_t - (a(x)\tilde{v}_x)_x - c(t,x)\tilde{v} = h_2(t,x), & (t,x) \in (T,T') \times (0,1), \\ \tilde{v}(t,0) = \tilde{v}(t,1) = 0, & t \in (T,T'), \\ \tilde{v}(T,x) = \psi(x)z^T(x) = z^T(x), & x \in (0,1), \end{cases}$$

where $h_2 := -(a\psi_x v)_x - a\psi_x v_x$ is supported in $(\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}) \cup (\tilde{\beta}, \beta)$. Finally,

$$u := \begin{cases} z, & t \in [0,T], \\ \tilde{v}, & t \in [T,T'] \end{cases}$$

is the solution of

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (a(x)u_x)_x + c(t,x)u = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T') \times (0,1),\\ u(t,0) = u(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T'),\\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,1), \end{cases}$$

with

$$h := \begin{cases} h_1, & t \in [0,T],\\ h_2, & t \in [T,T']. \end{cases}$$

Moreover

$$u(t,x) = 0 \ \text{ for } \ (t,x) \in [T,T'] \times ([0,\alpha] \cup [\beta,1]).$$

The estimate (6. 5) follows as in the first part. □

Remark 4. Proceeding as before, one can prove that Theorem 6.1 holds also for (5. 1) adding a drift term. In particular, Theorem 6.1 holds for the problem

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (a(x)u_x)_x + c(t,x)u + b(t,x)u_x = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1),\\ u(t,1) = u(t,0) = 0, & t \in (0,T),\\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in (0,1), \end{cases} \tag{6. 12}$$

where $u_0 \in L^2(0,1)$, $h \in L^2(Q_T)$, ω, a and c are as in the first part of this section, $b \in L^\infty(Q_T)$ and $|b(t,x)| \le C\sqrt{a(x)}$ for a positive constant C. Observe that, in this case, the well-posedness of (6. 12) follows by [24, Theorem 4.1].

While in the first part we have deduced the controllability result from the observability inequality (4. 2), now, we will deduce a *regional* observability inequality from the regional controllability result established in Theorem 6.1. This is a general strategy, which has been already employed in [13] and in [15] for degeneracies occurring at the boundary of the domain. In particular, considering the adjoint problem (5. 2), one has:

Corollary 6.1. *For every α and β satisfying* (6. 3)*, there exists a positive constant K_T such that every solution $v \in \mathcal{U}$ of* (5. 2) *satisfies*

$$\int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx \le K_T \left(\int_0^T \int_\omega v^2(t,x)dxdt + \int_\alpha^\beta v^2(T,x)dx \right). \tag{6. 13}$$

To prove Corollary 6.1, the following lemma is crucial.

Lemma 6.1. *Fixed α and β, let h be the control given by Theorem* 6.1.(i) *and u the corresponding solution of* (5. 1)*. Then, there exists a positive constant C_T such that*

$$\int_\alpha^\beta u^2(T,x)dx \le C_T \int_0^1 u_0^2(x)dx.$$

The proof of the previous lemma follows by the analogous of (2. 1) for problem (5. 1) (see [24, Theorem 4.1]) and by (6. 4).

Proof of Corollary 6.1. Let $v \in \mathcal{U}$ be a solution of (5. 2) and $h \in L^2(Q_T)$ be the control given by Theorem 6.1.(i) such that

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (a(x)u_x)_x + c(t,x)u = h(t,x)\chi_\omega(x), & (t,x) \in (0,T) \times (0,1) \\ u(t,0) = u(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T), \\ u(0,x) = v(0,x), & x \in (0,1) \\ u(T,x) = 0, & x \in [0,\alpha] \cup [\beta,1]. \end{cases}$$

Multiplying the previous equation by v and (5. 2) by u, integrating over $(0,1)$ and summing up we obtain

$$\int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt}(uv)dx = \int_0^1 h\chi_\omega v dx.$$

Integrating over $(0,T)$, by Fubini's Theorem, we have

$$\int_0^1 u(T,x)v(T,x)dx - \int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx = \int_0^T \int_0^1 h\chi_\omega v dx.$$

Since $u(T,x) = 0$ for all $x \in [0,\alpha] \cup [\beta,1]$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx &= \int_\alpha^\beta u(T,x)v(T,x)dx - \int_0^T \int_\omega hv dxdt \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}\int_\alpha^\beta u^2(T,x)dx + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\int_\alpha^\beta v^2(T,x)dx \\ &+ \frac{\epsilon}{2}\int_0^T \int_\omega h^2 dxdt + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\int_0^T \int_\omega v^2 dxdt, \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ will be chosen later. By Lemma 6.1, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx \quad &\leq \frac{\epsilon C_T}{2}\int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\int_\alpha^\beta v^2(T,x)dx \\ &+ \frac{\epsilon}{2}\int_0^T \int_\omega h^2 dxdt + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\int_0^T \int_\omega v^2(t,x)dxdt. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, (6. 4) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx \quad &\leq \frac{\epsilon C + \epsilon C_T}{2}\int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\int_0^T \int_\omega v^2(t,x)dxdt + \frac{1}{2\epsilon}\int_\alpha^\beta v^2(T,x)dx. \end{aligned}$$

Choosing ϵ such that $1 - \epsilon(C + C_T)/2 > 0$, one has

$$\int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx \leq K_T \left(\int_0^T \int_\omega v^2(t,x)dxdt + \int_\alpha^\beta v^2(T,x)dx \right).$$

□

Similarly, as a consequence of the persistent regional null controllability result established in Theorem 6.1, one can deduce another observability inequality for the *non homogeneous* adjoint problem, as the one given in [15] for boundary degeneracies. Indeed, given the adjoint system

$$\begin{cases} v_t + (av_x)_x - cv = G(t,x)\chi_{(T,T')}(t), & (x,t) \in (0,T') \times (0,1), \\ v(t,0) = v(t,1) = 0, & t \in (0,T'), \end{cases} \tag{6. 14}$$

one can prove the next result:

Corollary 6.2. *For every α and β satisfying* (6. 3)*, there exists a positive constant $K_{T'}$ such that every solution $v \in \mathcal{U}$ of* (6. 14) *satisfies*

$$\int_0^1 v^2(0,x)dx \le K_{T'} \left(\int_0^{T'} \int_\omega v^2(t,x)dxdt \right. \\ \left. + \int_\alpha^\beta v^2(T',x)dx + \int_T^{T'} \int_\alpha^\beta G^2(t,x)dxdt \right). \tag{6. 15}$$

By Remark 4, proceeding as before, one can prove that Corollaries 6.1 and 6.2 still hold for both the adjoint problem and the non homogeneous adjoint problem of (6. 12) with drift.

References

[1] E. M. Ait Ben Hassi, F. Ammar Khodja, A. Hajjaj, L. Maniar, *Null controllability of degenerate parabolic cascade systems*, Port. Math. **68** (2011), 345–367.

[2] F. Alabau-Boussouira, P. Cannarsa, G Fragnelli, *Carleman estimates for degenerate parabolic operators with applications to null controllability* J. Evol. Eqs **6** (2006), 161-204.

[3] K. Beauchard, P. Cannarsa, R. Guglielmi, *Null controllability of Grushin-type operators in dimension two*, submitted.

[4] K. Beauchard, E. Zuazua, *Some controllability results for the 2D Kolmogorov equation*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **26** (2009), 1793–1815.

[5] A. Bensoussan, G. Da Prato, M.C. Delfout, S.K. Mitter, *Representation and Control of Infinite Dimensional Systems*, Systems and Control: Foundations and applications, Birkhäuser, 1993.

[6] H. Brezis, *Functional Analysis, Sobolev Spaces and Partial Differential Equations*, Springer Science+Business Media, LLC 2011.

[7] J.M. Buchot, J.P. Raymond, *A linearized model for boundary layer equations*, in "Optimal control of complex structures" (Oberwolfach, 2000), Internat. Ser. Numer. Math. **139** (2002), Birkhauser, Basel, 31–42.

[8] M. Campiti, G. Metafune, D. Pallara, *Degenerate self-adjoint evolution equations on the unit interval*, Semigroup Forum **57** (1998), 1–36.

[9] P. Cannarsa, L. De Teresa, *Controllability of 1-D coupled degenerate parabolic equations*, Electron. J. Differential Equations **73** (2009), 1–21.

[10] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, *Null controllability of semilinear degenerate parabolic equations in bounded domains*, Electron. J. Differential Equations **2006** (2006), 1–20.

[11] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, D. Rocchetti, *Controllability results for a class of one-dimensional degenerate parabolic problems in nondivergence form*, J. Evol. Equ. **8** (2008), 583–616.

[12] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, D. Rocchetti, *Null controllability of degenerate parabolic operators with drift*, Netw. Heterog. Media **2** (2007), 693–713.

[13] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, J. Vancostenoble, *Regional controllability of semilinear degenerate parabolic equations in bounded domains*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **320** (2006), 804–818.

[14] P. Cannarsa, G. Fragnelli, J. Vancostenoble, *Linear degenerate parabolic equations in bounded domains: controllability and observability*, IFIP Int. Fed. Inf. Process. **202** (2006), 163–173, Springer, New York.

[15] P. Cannarsa, P. Martinez, J. Vancostenoble, *Persistent regional controllability for a class of degenerate parabolic equations*, Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. **3** (2004), 607–635.

[16] P. Cannarsa, P. Martinez, J. Vancostenoble, *Null controllability of the degenerate heat equations*, Adv. Differential Equations **10** (2005), 153–190.

[17] P. Cannarsa, P. Martinez, J. Vancostenoble, *Carleman estimates for a class of degenerate parabolic operators*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **47** (2008), 1–19.

[18] P. Cannarsa, P. Martinez, J. Vancostenoble *Carleman estimates and null controllability for boundary-degenerate parabolic operators*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I **347** (2009), 147–152.

[19] P. Cannarsa, D. Rocchetti, J. Vancostenoble, *Generator of analytic semigroups in L^2 for a class of second order degenerate elliptic operators*, Control Cybernet. **37** (2008), 831–878.

[20] H. Emamirad, G. R. Goldstein, J.A. Goldstein, *Chaotic solution for the Black-Scholes equation*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **140** (2012), 2043–2052.

[21] E. Fernández-Cara, E. Zuazua, *Null and approximate controllability for weakly blowing up semilinear heat equations,* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **17** (2000), 583–616.

[22] C. Flores, L. De Teresa, *Carleman estimates for degenerate parabolic equations with first order terms and applications*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **348** (2010), 391–396.

[23] G. Fragnelli, *Null controllability of degenerate parabolic equations in non divergence form via Carleman estimates*, to appear in Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. - S.

[24] G. Fragnelli, G. Ruiz Goldstein, J.A. Goldstein, S. Romanelli, *Generators with interior degeneracy on spaces of L^2 type*, submitted.

[25] A. V. Fursikov, O. Yu. Imanuvilov.*Controllability of evolution equations.* Lecture Notes Series, Research Institute of Mathematics, Global Analysis Research Center, Seoul National University 34, 1996.

[26] J. Le Rousseau, G. Lebeau, *On carleman estimates for elliptic and parabolic operators. applications to unique continuation and control of parabolic equations*, ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations, in press, DOI: 10.1051/cocv/2011168.

[27] G. Lebeau, L. Robbiano, *Contrôle exact de l'équation de la chaleur*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **20** (1995), 335–356.

[28] P. Martinez, J.P. Raymond, J. Vancostenoble, *Regional null controllability for a linearized Crocco type equation*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **42** (2003), 709–728.

[29] R.M. Mininni, S. Romanelli, *Martingale estimating functions for Feller diffusion processes generated by degenerate elliptic operators*, J. Concr. Appl. Math. **1** (2003), 191–216.

[30] D. Mugnolo, A. Rhandi, *On the domain of a Fleming-Viot type operator on an L^p space with invariant measure*, Note di Matematica **31** (2011), 139–148.

[31] J. Vancostenoble, *Sharp Carleman estimates for singular parabolic equations and application to Lipschitz stability in inverse source problems*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **348** (2010), 801–805.

[32] J. Vancostenoble, *Improved Hardy-Poincaré inequalities and sharp Carleman estimates for degenerate/singular parabolic problems*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. S **4** (2011), 761–790.

[33] J. Vancostenoble, E. Zuazua, *Hardy inequalities, observability, and control for the wave and Schrödinger equations with singular potentials*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **41** (2009), 1508–1532.

[34] J. Vancostenoble, E. Zuazua, *Null controllability for the heat equation with singular inverse-square potentials*, J. Funct. Anal. **254** (2008), 1864–1902.

[35] A. Stahel, *Degenerate semilinear parabolic equations*, Differential Integral Equations **5** (1992), 683–691.

[36] N. Shimakura, *Partial Differential Operators of elliptic type*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs **99** (1992), American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.